

Remarks/Arguments:

This is a reply to the office action of July 1, 2005, and is accompanied by a petition to revive the application.

The Examiner objected to the drawings because they did not show the lock casing mounted on a fire-blocking door, as required by claim 1. Inasmuch as the door is not actually part of the invention, we have amended claim 1 to recite that the casing is to be mounted on a door. This may be sufficient to enable the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the drawing. It is noted that the casing 30 shown in Fig. 4 corresponds to the casing 3 shown in Fig. 1, where the casing 3 is shown mounted on the door 2 just as the casing 30 will be.

The Examiner rejected the claims as anticipated by Patents 6,205,825 to Haeck and 5,890,752 to Lin.

Although the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), the subject matter of claims 12 - 15 has been incorporated into claim 1 in order to more clearly distinguish the present invention over the cited prior art.

The examiner indicated in the office action that claims 4, 10, 11, 14-15 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 1 as amended above incorporates claims 14 - 15 and intervening claims 12 - 13.

Claims 4, 10-11, and 17 contain additional limitations which are consistent with claim 1 and further distinguish the present invention from the prior art.

We believe that the claims now presented distinguish the invention from the prior art of record, and that the application is in proper form for allowance.

The following comments are presented for the record.

We understand that the Examiner considers that the main link carriage 128 disclosed by Haeck performs the functional combination of the safety latching member 35 and actuating piece 39 of the present invention. However, one may see from Figs. 5 - 7 and the description of those figures – as well from Fig. 3 and its related disclosure – that the main link carriage 128 of Haeck is similar in function only to the actuating piece 39 of the present invention. In other words, the main link carriage 128 of Haeck can never function like the safety latching member 35 of the present invention.

Moreover, the lock structure disclosed by Lin is actually similar to the prior art discussed in the present invention. The drawbacks of the prior lock structure disclosed by the Lin reference are those the present invention intends to fix and improve.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Fallow
Reg. No. 28,946

Shoemaker and Mattare, Ltd.
10 Post Office Road
Silver Spring, MD 20910
(301) 589-8900

January 31, 2006